UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,910	11/30/2001	Joan C. Teng	21756-011900	4169

51206   7590   10/07/2008
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
BLAIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2442	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/998,910	TENG, JOAN C.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DOUGLAS B. BLAIR	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 July 2008</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12,14-27,29-34 and 36-46* is/are pending in the application.
　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12,14-16,18,21-38,41-43,45 and 46* is/are rejected.
7)☒ Claim(s) *17,19,20,32,39,40 and 44* is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some *　c)☐ None of:
　　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/29/08 and 3/15/04</u>.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/29/2008 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Claims 1, 22, and 33 have been amended. Claims 1-12, 14-27, 29-34, 36-46 are currently

pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks/Arguments, filed 7/29/2008, with respect to the

rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 22, and 33 under 35 USC section 102 by Cheng have been fully

considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon

further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of U.S. Patent Number

7,308,702 to Thomsen et al.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the last limitation recites

"storing, the identity system" when it should probably read "storing, in the identity system".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-16, 18, 21-27, 29-31, 33-34, and 36-38 rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 7,308,702 to Thomsen et al.

As to claim 1, Thomsen teaches a method for defining a custom workflow for managing

entity identities, in an access management system comprising an identity system for managing

identity profiles and an access system for providing security of resources across one or more web

server **(col. 1, lines 21-35)**, the method comprising the steps of: accessing, at the access

management system, a template that indicates one or more parameters for defining one or more

custom workflows for managing identity profiles, wherein said one or more parameters define

operations to be performed on identity profiles as part of said one or more custom workflows

(col. 1, lines 57-63, the types of user are identity profiles); modifying the template by

receiving input configured to define workflow customization options, wherein the modifying of

the template is accomplished without the use of scripts by allowing a user to select and/or modify

the workflow customization options which are presented on the user in a graphical user interface

(col. 4, lines 29-36); dynamically creating, at the identity system, a definition of a first custom

workflow for managing an identity profile for at least one user, based on said modified template,

wherein said identity profile is used by said access management system to control access by said

at least one user to said resources across one or more web servers, wherein the first custom

workflow is configured to automate the process of managing the identity profile by executing the

operation defined by one or more custom workflow parameters **(col. 6, lines 13-col. 7, line 35)**;

and storing, at the identity system, said definition of said first custom workflow at a mass storage

device **(col. 6, lines 13-col. 7, line 35)**.

As to claim 2, Thomsen teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein: said template

includes a set of parameters for each action available to a workflow type **(col. 6, lines 13-col. 7,
line 35)**.

As to claim 4, Thomsen teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising the

steps of: adding data to said template after said step of storing; creating a definition of a second

workflow after said step of adding data; and storing said definition of said second workflow **(col.
6, lines 13-col. 7, line 35))**.

As to claim 5, Thomsen teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising the

step of: creating the template **(col. 6, lines 13-col. 7, line 35)**

As to claim 6, Thomsen teaches a method according to claim 5, wherein said step of

creating said template includes the steps of: adding a set of workflow types to said template;

adding one or more actions for at least a subset of said workflow types; and adding parameters

for at least a subset of said actions **(col. 6, lines 13-col. 7, line 35)**.

As to claim 7, Thomsen teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein: said template

applies to only one application **(col. 6, lines 13-col. 7, line 35)**.

As to claim 8, Thomsen teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein: said template

includes parameters for creating objects, deleting objects and changing attributes **(col. 6, lines

13-col. 7, line 35)**.

As to claim 9, Thomsen teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein: said template

includes parameters for self registration **(col. 6, lines 13-col. 7, line 35)**.

As to claim 10, Thomsen teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein: said template

includes a parameter indicating whether supplied variables can be used in said step of creating

(col. 6, lines 13-col. 7, line 35).

As to claim 11, Thomsen teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein: said template

includes a parameter indicating whether additional workflows can be used to supply data **(col. 6,

lines 13-col. 7, line 35)**.

As to claim 12, Thomsen teaches a method according to claim 11, wherein: said

additional workflows includes multiple levels of nesting of workflows **(col. 6, lines 13-col. 7,

line 35)**.

As to claim 14, Thomsen teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said step of

creating includes the step of: accessing one or more parameters in said template; offering a set of

options based on said accessed parameters; and receiving a selection of one or more of said

offered options **(col. 6, lines 13-col. 7, line 35)**

As to claim 15, Thomsen teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said step of creating includes the steps of: determining a first set of possible actions for a particular step based on said template; reporting said first set of possible actions; and receiving a selection of a first action of said first set of possible actions **(col. 6, lines 13-col. 7, line 35)**.

As to claim 16, Thomsen teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said step of creating includes the steps of: determining a first set of possible data types for a particular action based on said template; reporting said first set of possible data types; receiving an indication of a variable for said first workflow; and receiving a selection of a first data type for said variable **(col. 6, lines 13-col. 7, line 35)**

As to claim 18, Thomsen teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said step of creating includes the steps of: determining whether pre actions are available for a particular action based on said template; reporting whether pre actions are available for said particular action; and receiving a selection of whether to add pre actions to said definition of said first workflow for said particular action **(col. 6, lines 13-col. 7, line 35)**.

As to claim 21, Thomsen teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said step of creating includes the steps of: accessing one or more parameters in said template; offering a set of options in a graphical user interface based on said accessed parameters; and receiving a selection of one or more of said offered options using said graphical user interface **(col. 6, lines 13-col. 7, line 35)**.

As to claims 22-27, 29-31, 33, and 34-38, they are rejected for the same reasoning as claims 1-12, 14-16, 18, and 21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 41-43, and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over U.S. Patent Number 7,308,702 to Thomsen et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 7,080,078

to Slaughter et al.

As to claims 3, 41-43, and 45-46, Cheng does not explicitly teach the use of XML for

performing workflow functions.

Slaughter teaches the use of XML messages for performing workflow functions (col. 8,

lines 24-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the

time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cheng regarding the management of users with

workflows with the teachings of Slaughter regarding XML because XML provides a way of

standardizing messages via a network.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 17, 19, 20, 32, 39, 40, and 44 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected

base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Thomsen does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 17, 19, 20, 32, 39, 40, and 44 and

the prior art does not make these teachings obvious in view of Thomsen.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS B. BLAIR whose telephone number is (571)272-

3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Douglas B Blair/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142